

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

AUTOSCRIBE CORPORATION,	§ § §
<i>Plaintiff,</i>	§ § §
v.	§ § §
NUVEI CORPORATION, NUVEI TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION, NUVEI LIMITED, AND NUVEI INTERNATIONAL GROUP LIMITED,	§ § § § § §
<i>Defendant.</i>	§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:24-CV-00325-JRG

ORDER

Before the Court is the Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(2) and 12(b)(3) filed by Defendants Nuvei Corporation and Nuvei Technologies Corporation (Dkt. No. 15) (“the Motion”). In the Motion, Defendants seek the dismissal of Plaintiffs Autoscribe Corporation’s (“Plaintiff”) Complaint (Dkt. No. 1) under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(2) and 12(b)(3). Since the filing of the Motion, Plaintiff has filed an Amended Complaint (Dkt. No. 35).

It is well established that a later-filed amended pleading moots a motion asking the Court to dismiss or strike an earlier-filed pleading. *See Griffin v. Am. Zurich Ins. Co.*, 697 F. App’x 793, 797 (5th Cir. 2017) (“Once filed, that amended complaint rendered all earlier motions . . . moot.”); *see also Bishop Display Tech LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.*, No. 2:21-cv-00139-JRG, Dkt. No. 40 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 4, 2021) (“Once Plaintiff filed its amended complaint, the Motion became moot.”); *Ultravision Technologies, LLC v. Eaton Corp. PLC*, 2019 WL 11250161, at *1 (E.D.

Tex. Nov. 7, 2019) (“Accordingly, the filing of an amended complaint moots a motion to dismiss the original complaint.”).

Accordingly, the Court finds that the Motion (Dkt. No. 15) should be and hereby is
DENIED-AS-MOOT.

So Ordered this

Nov 15, 2024



RODNEY GILSTRAP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE